ID. Date of interview date 11/02/20

ID. Time interview started

start 16:31:19

ID.end Completion date of interview

Date 11/02/20

ID.end Time interview ended

16:34:41

ID. Duration of interview

time 3.37

new case

ICO consultation on the draft right of access guidance

Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?
O Yes
○ No
If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?
We only wish to comment on the part of the draft guidance that relates to clarifications.

Q1

Q2	Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?
	O Yes
	○ No
	O Unsure / don't know
	If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?
	We only wish to comment on the part of the draft guidance that relates to clarifications.

Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?
O Yes
○ No
O Unsure / don't know
If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.
We only wish to comment on the part of the draft guidance that relates to clarifications.

Q3

We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).
We only wish to comment on the part of the draft guidance that relates to

We only wish to comment on the part of the draft guidance that relates to clarifications.

		1 - Not at all useful	2 – Slightly useful	3 – Moderately useful	4 – Very useful	5 – Extremely useful
		0	0	\otimes	0	0
Q6	Why have you given this score	?				
	We only wish to comment on to clarifications.	the part of t	the draft g	uidance that	: relates t	0
Q7	To what extent do you agree tha	t the draft gu	uidance is d	clear and eas	sy to unde	erstand?
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
		0	0	⊘	0	0

On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

Q5

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

We welcome the opportunity to share our opinions against the proposed change to the timescales for compliance with data subject access requests. In our experience, the proposal to keep the clock running while awaiting clarification from an individual is neither reasonable nor practicable, for reasons such as listed below: - We work with a large number of individuals (students, visiting lecturers, etc.) who take a very long time to respond to requests for clarification, sometimes months - Responding to subject access requests sometimes involves searching, collecting and collating large volumes of information from several service areas and where clarification is received within a short period ahead of the deadline, it becomes practically impossible to meet our obligations under the law - The pressure of time is highly likely to increase human error in the management and security of personal data resulting in breaches - The pressure to meet obligatory requirements under these circumstances is bound to encourage processing without seeking clarification' which is likely to be problematic for both controllers and individuals

Q9	Are you answering as:
	O An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
	An individual acting in a professional capacity
	On behalf of an organisation
	Other
	Please specify the name of your organisation:
	City, University of London
	What sector are you from:

Higher Education (Public Sector)

Q10	How did you find out about this survey?
	O ICO Twitter account
	O ICO Facebook account
	O ICO LinkedIn account
	O ICO website
	O ICO newsletter
	O ICO staff member
	Colleague
	Personal/work Twitter account
	Personal/work Facebook account
	Personal/work LinkedIn account
	Other
	If other please specify:
	PDP Training Newsletter; PLC Practical Law Newsletter